REMARKS

1. Summary of the Office Action

In the Office action mailed April 1, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 12-21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,223,827 (Bell) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,434,715 (Anderson), U.S. Pat. No. 6,502,131 (Vaid), and U.S. Pat. No. 5,245,615 (Treu).

2. Status of the Claims

Presently pending are claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 12-21, 23, and 25-28, of which claims, 1, 8, 21 and 23 are independent, and the remainder are dependent. Claims 25-28 are new. Applicants have amended various claims as follows.

Applicants have amended claim 1 by introducing identifying terminology for referencing received event conditions. Specifically, the terms "given" and "particular" are used to indentify one or another "event condition" recited in the claim, and thereby help clarify the claim language with respect to these event conditions. Applicants have also amended claim 1 to more particularly specify a "normal event log entry" as one for which "fewer than a first number of event log entries each corresponding to an event condition equivalent to the given event condition have been logged to the event log display during the first time period." Applicants have further amended claim 1 to more particularly specify a "recurring event log entry" as one for which "at least the first number of event log entries each corresponding to an event condition equivalent to the given event condition have been logged to the event log display during the first time period." Applicants have additionally amended claim 1 to more particularly specify that "excluding from the event log display an event log entry corresponding to a particular event condition" is based upon a determination

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone (312) 913-0001

12

Attorney Docket No.: 01-491
S/N: 09/897,518
Filing Date: July 2, 2001

that the particular event condition is equivalent to one that corresponds to a "recurring event log entry," and that "at least a second number of event conditions equivalent to the particular event condition have been received during a second time." The meaning of a "recurring event log entry" and "normal log event entry" is established with respect to a "given event condition," and is applied in connection with excluding an event log entry corresponding to a "particular event condition." Finally, Applicants have removed limitations with respect to SNMP, and have introduced other, minor language clarifications. Support for these amendments can be found generally throughout the original specification, as well as at least in Figure 2 and the explanatory text at page 10, line 8 – page 14, line 11.

Applicants have amended each of claims 4 and 5 to ensure consistent antecedent basis with base claim 1, as well as to introduce other, minor language clarifications. Support for these amendments is at least the same as that for claim 1.

Applicants have amended independent claims 8, 21, and 23 in a manner substantially similar to that of claim 1. Support for these amendments is at least the same as that for claim 1.

Applicants have amended each of dependent claims 12-20 to ensure consistent antecedent basis with base claim 8, as well as to introduce other, minor language clarifications in view of the amendments to claim 1. Support for these amendments is at least the same as that for claim 1.

Applicants note that in a response filed July 30, 2007, and in all subsequently filed responses up until the present response, claims 13 and 19 were presented with a status of "previously presented," but both included the word "~~list~~" (with a strike-through). The word "list" was deleted from both claims as part of an amendment in a response filed January 31,

2007. The continued presence of "~~list~~" in claims 13 and 19 of subsequent responses (in which these claims were presented with a status of "previously presented") was an inadvertent error. The present response corrects this error (in addition to introducing amendments noted above).

New claims 25, 26, 27, 28 depend from claims 1, 8, 21, and 24, respectively. Each of the new dependent claims specifies that the event condition is an SNMP event condition. As such, each of the new claims is directed to subject matter that was removed from each of the respective base claims, as noted above.

No new matter has been added by way of any of the above amendments.

3.   Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

a.   Claims 1, 8, 21, and 23

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 8, 21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the combination of Bell, Anderson, Vaid, and Treu. Applicants submit that the combination of Bell, Anderson, Vaid, and Treu does not reasonably or logically lead to Applicants' claimed invention. Applicants therefore submit that the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn. Applicants first direct their remarks to claim 1, and subsequently address claims 8, 21, and 23.

The combination of Bell, Anderson, and Vaid does not logically or reasonably lead to "excluding from the event log display an event log entry corresponding to a particular event condition, upon a determination that (i) a recurring event log entry corresponding to an event condition equivalent to the particular event condition has already been logged and (ii) at least a second number of event conditions equivalent to the particular event condition have been received during a second time period"

Bell teaches a process and apparatus for managing network event counters. In particular, Bell teaches how a "sliding event threshold counter" and a "sliding interval counter"

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone (312) 913-0001

14

Attorney Docket No.: 01-491
S/N: 09/897,518
Filing Date: July 2, 2001

may be used to provide relative values of event counts and time passage with respect to absolute values of these metrics (e.g., Abstract). Anderson teaches a method of detecting systematic fault conditions in an intelligent electronic device. More specifically, the invention of Anderson seeks to use repeated observation of certain errors as an aid to detecting systematic fault conditions (e.g., Abstract). Treu teaches a diagnostic system and interface for a personal computer. In particular, a log entry may maintain a count of multiple occurrences of same errors (column 5, lines 41-45).

The combination of Bell, Anderson, and Treu does not teach or suggest logging a "recurring event log entry" based on receiving during a *first* time period a *first* number of log entries corresponding to an event condition equivalent to a given event condition, and excluding an event log entry corresponding to a particular event condition based on determining that "(i) a recurring event log entry corresponding to an event condition equivalent to the particular event condition has already been logged and (ii) at least a *second* number of event conditions equivalent to the particular event condition have been received during a *second* time period." That is, the combination of Bell, Anderson, and Treu does not teach or suggest establishing recurrence based on a *first* number of occurrences of equivalent event conditions during a *first* time period, and excluding log display of further equivalent event conditions based on a *second* number of occurrences during a *second* time period, as recited, in one way or another, in claim 1.

Moreover, while the combination may be relevant to tracking repeating events, there is no teaching or suggestion in the combination that would logically or reasonably lead to use of two distinct time periods and two distinct numbers as recited, in one way or another, in

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone (312) 913-0001

15

Attorney Docket No.: 01-491
S/N: 09/897,518
Filing Date: July 2, 2001

claim 1. Applicants therefore submit that the combination of Bell, Anderson, and Treu does not logically or reasonably lead to the invention of claim 1, and that claim 1 is allowable.

Each of independent claims 8, 21, and 23 include, *inter alia*, limitations similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. Applicants submit that their arguments with respect to claim 1 therefore apply to claims 8, 21, and 23 as well, and that claims 8, 21, and 23 are allowable for at least the reasons claim 1 is allowable.

b.   Claims 4, 5, 12-20, and 25-28

Each of claims 4, 5, 12-20, and 25-28 depend, in one way or another, from one of independent claims 1, 8, 21, or 23, all of which are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicants submit that for at least this reason, claims 4, 5, 12-20, and 25-28 are allowable as well. Further, Applicants do not concede any of the Examiner's specific assertions with regard to claim 4, 5, or 12-20.

4.   Conclusion

The Applicants submit that the application is in good and proper form for allowance and respectfully request the Examiner to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at 312-913-3353.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Date: August 7, 2009   By: /David A. Grabelsky/
                                       David A. Grabelsky
                                       Registration No. 59,208

McDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606
TELEPHONE (312) 913-0001

16

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 01-491
S/N: 09/897,518
FILING DATE: JULY 2, 2001